

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,100	SHIPTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TIMOTHY H. MEEKS	1792	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) TIMOTHY H. MEEKS. (3) Moshe Wilensky.

(2) Michael Miller. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2/10/09.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Klotz and Bomberger.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion with regards to the combination of Claim 1 was had. Attorney for Applicant raised the question of reaction chemistries of magnesium and titanium and whether or not a corrosive-protecting coating for one would have been obvious to use on the other..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael G. Miller/	/Timothy H Meeks/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792
---------------------	---